

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20-31 remain in the application. Claims 29-31 are new and consideration of these new claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been objected to for an improper dependency claim. Claim 16 has been amended to state that the claim depends from claim 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11, 14, 18, 21-22, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office action questions whether claims 1 and 28 include a "connecting body" as claimed subject matter. Both claims are amended herein to clarify that the "connecting body" is included as claimed subject matter.

The Office action questions claims 11 and 14 for including both the terms "engagement grooves" and "guide grooves". The claims have been amended to consistently use the term "guide grooves".

Regarding claim 21, the Office action asks whether in the phrase "means for the attachment of means", both "means" elements are to be claimed. Applicant states that both means terms are claimed. To clarify, for example referring to paragraph [0026] of the Substitute Specification, the first "means" recited may be a clamp or hook, and the second "means" recited may be a receptacle for attaching

Claims 2-3, 7-18, and 20-25 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-18, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rheinmetall is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 includes the features:

"the device is operable with curavatures in different directions of curvature",
and

"guide rails and conveying bodies are loosely guided with respect to one another".

Rheinmetall does not disclose these features. First, Rheinmetall teaches only one direction of curvature, as can be seen in Fig. 1, reproduced earlier. And in contrast to the second feature, Rheinmetall discloses repeatedly that the carriages disclosed therein are guided "without play". See for example, page 2 of the Rheinmetall translation, the paragraph beginning "According to the invention.....free from play" and on the third page of the translation the paragraph starting with "All six surfaces...." Page 1 of the translation describes how the bodies are moved on a precisely defined trajectory. Rheinmetall does not disclose all of the features of claim 28 and in fact teaches away from such features by teaching a device with only one type of curvature and without play. Some degree of play would be necessary in order to enable movement around a second direction of curvature.

The purpose and the device themselves in Rheinmetall are directed to establishing movement of the midpoints of the carriages along an exact arc, such that parts conveyed on the carriages can be machined while in the arc section of the

transport path. For this purpose, the movement of the carriages is effected without play.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rheinmetall is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rheinmetall in view of EP0338500 to Gartner Franz (hereinafter Gartner Franz). Claim 4 depends from amended claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Rheinmetall for the reasons stated above, and Gartner Franz fails to cure the cited deficiencies described in Rheinmetall. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rheinmetall in view of U.S. 3,690,433 to Buldini (hereinafter Buldini). Claims 5-6 also depend from amended claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Rheinmetall for the reasons stated above, and Buldini fails to cure the cited deficiencies described in Rheinmetall. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

New claims 29-31 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over the cited art at least for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. FRR-16841.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700